arXiv:1703.01002v2 [stat.AP] 26 Mar 2017

# Statistical Properties of the Risk-Transfer Formula in the Affordable Care Act

Michelle Li* and Donald Richards†

March 28, 2017

**Abstract**

The Affordable Care Act, signed into United States law in 2010, led to the formation of competitive insurance plans which provide universal health-insurance coverage without regard to pre-existing medical conditions. To assist insurers during a transitional period, the Act introduced a *risk-transfer formula* which requires insurance plans with healthier enrollees to transfer funds to plans with sicker enrollees, thereby dissuading plans from favoring healthier enrollees.

In this paper, we treat the risk-transfer amounts as random variables and derive some of their statistical properties by analyzing their means and variances. The results in this paper lead to an explanation for the empirical phenomena, observed by the American Academy of Actuaries, that risk-transfer amounts were more variable and can be extremely large for insurers with smaller market shares. Our results provide conditions, as functions of the market shares of insurance plans, under which those phenomena hold.

*Key words and phrases*: Actuarial value; Affordable Care Act; Plan liability risk score, President Barack Obama; Reinsurance; Risk corridor; Risk-transfer formula.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 62P05; Secondary: 60E05.
*JEL Classification System.* I13, G22.

# 1 Introduction

In March 2010, United States President Barack Obama signed into law the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, known colloquially as the "Affordable Care Act"

*Schreyer Honors College, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.
†Department of Statistics, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.

(ACA) or "Obamacare." The goals of the Act were to reduce health-care costs nationwide, increase the number of residents having health-insurance, and improve the quality of health-care.

Before the introduction of the ACA, it was common practice for health-insurers to use prior information on enrollees' health conditions to set premium rates or deny coverage, if appropriate. The ACA created across the U.S. groups of competitive marketplaces of health-insurance plans to provide insurance coverage without regard to pre-existing medical conditions. Because of this major change, the ACA introduced three measures to assist insurers financially during a transitional period. These measures, known as the "three R's," are *reinsurance*, *risk corridors*, and *risk-adjustment*.

Under the reinsurance measure, funding is provided to health-insurance plans which incur enormously high claims costs. Risk corridors are designed to limit issuers' losses and profits, thereby guarding against inaccurate health-insurance rates. These two measures were planned to be temporary in nature and to end after 2016.

The last "R," risk-adjustment, is a permanent measure which will transfer funds from low-risk health-insurance plans to high-risk plans, the fund transfer program being administered through the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. The risk-adjustment methodology is based on a mathematical formula called the *risk-transfer formula*, and it is that formula which is the focus of this paper.

According to the devisers of the risk-transfer formula, the purpose of the risk-adjustment methodology is "to lessen or eliminate the influence of risk selection on the premiums that plans charge and the incentive for plans to avoid sicker enrollees" (Kautter, *et al.*, 2014, p. 1). Differences in premiums ideally will reflect differences in *actuarial value*, i.e., generosity of insurance coverage, and also will reflect differences in *induced demand*, i.e., a tendency for people with higher levels of insurance coverage to use their insurance more frequently.

Although the risk-transfer formula is designed to equalize competition among insurance plans, actuaries have observed the empirical phenomena that risk-transfer amounts were more variable and can be extremely large for insurers with smaller market shares (American Academy of Actuaries, 2016, p. 10). That is, smaller insurance plans tended to have risk-transfer amounts of large magnitude; and the observed volatility in risk-transfer amounts was substantially higher for insurance plans with smaller market shares than for plans with larger market shares. Consequently, the rate of insolvency of smaller plans was substantially higher, leading to a decrease in the number of plans and consolidation among surviving plans.

In this paper, we provide an explanation for these empirical phenomena. We will show that the potentially large-magnitude risk-transfer amounts and the higher volatility in those amounts experienced by insurance plans with smaller market share are purely a consequence of the mathematical structure of the risk-transfer formula. On treating the terms in the risk-transfer formula as random variables and investigating

their means, variances, and covariances we shall see that the mean of a plan's risk-transfer amount often can be larger for plans with smaller market share. Moreover, the variance of a plan's risk-transfer amount often can be a *decreasing* function of the plan's market share. Alternatively put, larger insurance plans often will have smaller, and less volatile, risk-transfer amounts; and smaller insurance plans will tend to have larger and more volatile risk-transfer amounts.

Our results apply, beyond the Affordable Care Act, to any health-insurance system in which risk-equalization is sought by means of zero-sum transfer payment procedures.

## 2 The risk-transfer formula

We denote by $N$ the number of insurance plans in a given marketplace. For $i = 1, \ldots, N$, the factors used to calculate the risk-transfer amounts for the $i$th plan are the following (Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, 2013, pp. 15430–15432; Pope, *et al.*, 2014, pp. E3-E5, and E19):

$PLRS_i$: A weighted average of Plan $i$'s *plan liability risk scores* in the risk-adjustment model, weighted by enrollment months.

$IDF_i$: Plan $i$'s *induced demand factor*, a quantity designed to account for the tendency for people with higher levels of coverage to use their insurance more frequently.

$GCF_i$: Plan $i$'s *geographic cost factor*, which accounts for variables affecting premiums that vary geographically, such as input prices and medical care utilization rates.

$AV_i$: Plan $i$'s *actuarial value*; this term is implicitly included in the $PLRS_i$ term because it is considered in the risk score model.

$ARF_i$: Plan $i$'s *allowable rating factor*; this is also implicitly included in the $PLRS_i$ term and reflects the effects of allowable ratings factors, e.g., age.

$s_i$: Plan $i$'s share of market-wide enrollment.

$\bar{P}_s$: State-wide enrollment-weighted market average plan premium.

For $i = 1, \ldots, N$, the *risk-transfer payment per member-month* for the $i$th plan is defined as

$$T_i = \left[ \frac{PLRS_i \cdot IDF_i \cdot GCF_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} (s_j \cdot PLRS_j \cdot IDF_j \cdot GCF_j)} - \frac{AV_i \cdot ARF_i \cdot IDF_i \cdot GCF_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} (s_j \cdot AV_j \cdot ARF_j \cdot IDF_j \cdot GCF_j)} \right] \bar{P}_s, \quad (2.1)$$

where the sums over $j$ in each denominator are over all insurance plans in a given risk pool. Once $T_i$ is calculated, the final amount of funds transferred by the $i$th plan equals

$Ms_iT_i$, where $M$ is the total member-months for all plans in the risk pool (Pope, et al., 2014; Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2016, p. 81). Thus, negative values of $T_i$ correspond to a charge imposed on the $i$th plan, and positive values of $T_i$ correspond to an inflow of funds to the plan.

The first term inside the square brackets on the right-hand side of Eq. (2.1) contains the $PLRS_i$, which reflects patient health and actuarial value. By contrast, the second term includes $AV_i$ and $ARF_i$, the actuarial value and allowable rating factors, in place of $PLRS_i$. Thus, the risk-transfer formula subtracts the premium without risk selection from the premium with risk selection. This subtraction is thus designed to achieve the purpose of reducing risk selection by insurance plans.

We note that both terms inside the square brackets on the right-hand side of the formula are calculated as percentages of their corresponding state-wide totals and then are multiplied by $\bar{P}_s$. The risk-transfer formula ensures that the sum of all $s_iT_i$ equals zero. Consequently, the risk-adjustment procedure is a zero-sum process in that plans receiving payments are balanced by other plans disbursing payments. This and other properties of the risk-transfer formula will be explored in the following section.

# 3 Properties of the risk-transfer formula

We remark that $s_i > 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$ since each functioning insurance plan necessarily has a positive market share. Further, $s_1 + \cdots + s_N = 1$ because all plans in the state jointly enroll the state's entire ACA market share. A crucial characteristic of the risk-transfer formula is that the weighted sum of all transfers equals zero, ensuring that the total amount of funds flowing between insurance plans is unchanged (Pope, *et al.*, 2014). We state this result as follows.

**Proposition 3.1.** (Pope, *et al.*, 2014, Eq. (A5)) *The risk-transfer amounts $T_1, \ldots, T_N$ satisfy the zero-sum condition,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} s_iT_i = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

The proof of this result follows directly from Eq. (2.1).

Although weighted sums of risk-transfer amounts are important to the functioning of the risk-adjustment program, it is the individual transfers which are of primary interest to specific insurance plans. Thus, we discuss the set of possible values of the quantities $T_i$ in Eq. (2.1).

Consider the case in which there are three plans in an insurance marketplace. If $s_1$ and $T_1$ are specified then we obtain an equation,

$$s_2T_2 + s_3T_3 = -s_1T_1,$$

where $s_2, s_3 > 0$, and $s_2 + s_3 = 1 - s_1$. Consequently, for any value of $s_2$ such that $0 < s_2 < 1 - s_1$ and for any value of $T_2$, there exists an admissible value for $T_3$.

Thus, if there are three or more plans in a state then no upper or lower bound on the risk-transfer amounts for other plans can be determined from a knowledge of the transfer amount for a single plan. This lack of upper or lower bounds subjects individual plans to unlimited, and therefore to potentially volatile, risk-transfer payments. As a consequence, smaller insurance plans are likely to be in greater danger of insolvency.

We assume, for simplicity, that the market shares $s_1, \ldots, s_N$ are deterministic. We consider the transfer amounts $T_1, \ldots, T_N$ as random variables, all of which are assumed to have finite means and variances. We denote by $\mu_i$ the expected value of $T_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$. Taking expectations in Eq. (3.1) and solving for $\mu_N$, we obtain

$$\mu_N = -\frac{1}{s_N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} s_i \mu_i. \tag{3.2}$$

Suppose that $s_N$ is very small. For given values of $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{N-1}$ and given values of $s_1, \ldots, s_{N-1}$, the outcome of division in Eq. (3.2) by $s_N$ often will result in a number $\mu_N$ whose magnitude is large. Consequently, insurers with very small market shares will be at risk of bearing negative risk-transfer amounts, in which case those amounts may be extremely large.

This observation is consistent with empirical data depicted in Figure 4 in a report of the American Academy of Actuaries (2016, p. 10). In that figure, which provides a scatterplot of risk-transfer amounts *vs.* insurance plan market shares for 2014, it is evident that plans with small market shares experienced risk-transfer amounts of very large magnitudes.

To analyze the variability of the risk-transfer amounts we denote the covariance, $\mathrm{Cov}(T_i, T_j)$, between $T_i$ and $T_j$ by $\sigma_{i,j}$, $1 \le i < j \le N$. Also, we denote the variance, $\mathrm{Var}(T_i)$, of $T_i$ by $\sigma_{i,i}$, $1 \le i \le N$. Then, we obtain the following result.

**Proposition 3.2.** *For general $N$, the variance of the risk-transfer amount for the $N$th insurance plan is given by*

$$\sigma_{N,N} = \frac{1}{s_N^2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} s_i^2 \sigma_{i,i} + 2 \sum_{1 \le i < j \le N-1} s_i s_j \sigma_{i,j} \right). \tag{3.3}$$

*Proof.* By Eq. (3.1),

$$-s_N T_N = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} s_i T_i.$$

We now calculate the variance of each side of this equation, applying to the right-hand side a well-known formula for the variance of a linear combination of random variables

(Ross, 2006, p. 357). Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} s_N^2 \sigma_{N,N} &= \mathrm{Var}(-s_N T_N) \\ &= \mathrm{Var}\left( \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} s_i T_i \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} s_i^2 \mathrm{Var}(T_i) + 2 \sum_{1 \le i < j \le N-1} s_i s_j \mathrm{Cov}(T_i, T_j) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} s_i^2 \sigma_{i,i} + 2 \sum_{1 \le i < j \le N-1} s_i s_j \sigma_{i,j}. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides of the latter equation by $s_N^2$, we obtain Eq. (3.3). □

# 4 Implications of the variance formula

Consider the case in which $s_N$ is small. Since $s_N^2 < s_N$ then division by $s_N^2$ in (3.3) could also result in large values of $\sigma_{N,N}$. Thus, an insurance plan which has a small market share is in danger of having a risk-transfer amount which has a very large variance.

There is also the issue of how $\sigma_{N,N}$ may change in response to changes in $s_N$. Consider again the case in which $N = 3$. By Eq. (3.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{3,3} &= \frac{1}{s_3^2}(s_1^2 \sigma_{1,1} + s_2^2 \sigma_{2,2} + 2 s_1 s_2 \sigma_{1,2}) \\ &= \frac{s_1^2 \sigma_{1,1} + s_2^2 \sigma_{2,2} + 2 s_1 s_2 \sigma_{1,2}}{(1 - s_1 - s_2)^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

To ascertain the behavior of $\sigma_{3,3}$ as a function of the market shares $s_1$ and $s_2$, we calculate the gradient of $\sigma_{3,3}$ with respect to $s_1$ and $s_2$. On differentiating Eq. (4.1) with respect to $s_1$ and simplifying the resulting expression, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{1}{2}(1 - s_1 - s_2)^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial s_1} \sigma_{3,3} &= (1 - s_1 - s_2)(s_1 \sigma_{1,1} + s_2 \sigma_{1,2}) + (s_1^2 \sigma_{1,1} + s_2^2 \sigma_{2,2} + 2 s_1 s_2 \sigma_{1,2}) \\ &= s_1(1 - s_2)\sigma_{1,1} + s_2^2 \sigma_{2,2} + s_2(1 + s_1 - s_2)\sigma_{1,2}. \end{aligned}$$

Setting this to be greater than or equal to 0, we find that $\partial \sigma_{3,3} / \partial s_1 \ge 0$ if and only if

$$\sigma_{1,2} \ge -\frac{s_1(1 - s_2)\sigma_{1,1} + s_2^2 \sigma_{2,2}}{s_2(1 + s_1 - s_2)}. \tag{4.2}$$

By a similar calculation, we also find that $\partial \sigma_{3,3} / \partial s_2 \ge 0$ if and only if

$$\sigma_{1,2} \ge -\frac{s_2(1 - s_1)\sigma_{2,2} + s_1^2 \sigma_{1,1}}{s_1(1 + s_2 - s_1)}. \tag{4.3}$$

Therefore, when the inequalities (4.2) and (4.3) hold, $\sigma_{3,3}$ increases as $s_1$ or $s_2$ increase. In such a situation, the variance of the risk-adjustment transfer amount for Plan 3 will increase as its market share $s_3$ decreases, and this will place insurers who are losing enrollees in an even more precarious situation.

To find examples of this phenomenon, we first characterize the structure of $\mathbf{\Sigma} = (\sigma_{i,j})$, the covariance matrix of $(T_1, \ldots, T_N)$. To that end, define the $(N-1)\times 1$ column vector $\boldsymbol{s} = (s_1, \ldots, s_{N-1})$, and let $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ be a $(N-1)\times(N-1)$ positive definite matrix representing the covariance matrix of $(T_1, \ldots, T_{N-1})$. By Eq. (3.3),

$$\sigma_{N,N} = s_N^{-2}\boldsymbol{s}'\mathbf{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{s}. \tag{4.4}$$

where $\boldsymbol{s}'$ denotes the transpose of $\boldsymbol{s}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_{1,N}, \ldots, \sigma_{N-1,N})'$, a $(N-1)\times 1$ column vector, and set

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda} & \boldsymbol{\sigma} \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma}' & \sigma_{N,N} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.5}$$

By Eq. (3.1), the random variables $T_1, \ldots, T_N$ satisfy a linear relationship; therefore $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ necessarily is singular. Applying to Eq. (4.5) a well-known formula for the determinant of a partitioned matrix (Anderson, 2003, p. 637), we obtain

$$\left(\sigma_{N,N} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}'\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right)\det(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \det(\mathbf{\Sigma}) = 0;$$

equivalently,

$$\sigma_{N,N} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}'\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}. \tag{4.6}$$

Comparing Eqs. (4.4) and (4.6), we obtain

$$\left(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right)'\left(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right) \equiv \boldsymbol{\sigma}'\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \sigma_{N,N} = s_N^{-2}\boldsymbol{s}'\mathbf{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{s} \equiv \left(s_N^{-1}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{s}\right)'\left(s_N^{-1}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{s}\right).$$

By a well-known result in linear algebra, there exists an $(N-1)\times(N-1)$ orthogonal matrix $\boldsymbol{H}$ such that

$$\boldsymbol{H}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma} = s_N^{-1}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{s}.$$

Consequently,

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = s_N^{-1}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{H}'\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{s},$$

so we obtain

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda} & s_N^{-1}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{H}'\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{s} \\ s_N^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}'\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{H}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2} & s_N^{-2}\boldsymbol{s}'\mathbf{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{s} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.7}$$

This result provides a general representation of the covariance matrix of $(T_1, \ldots, T_N)$. Moreover, although we derived this representation under the assumption that $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is nonsingular, the final result in Eq. (4.7) remains valid even if $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is singular.

To find specific examples for which the inequalities (4.2) and (4.3) are valid, we choose $\boldsymbol{H}$ to be the identity matrix of order $N-1$, in which case

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda} & s_N^{-1}\mathbf{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{s} \\ s_N^{-1}\boldsymbol{s}'\mathbf{\Lambda} & s_N^{-2}\boldsymbol{s}'\mathbf{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{s} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.8}$$

and then we use the statistical package *R* (R Core Team, 2013) or proceed manually to generate examples of the covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ in Eq. (4.8).

In one such example with $N = 3$, we have market shares $s_1 = 0.90$, $s_2 = 0.06$, and $s_3 = 0.04$. In this example, the first plan has a market share of 90%, which is much larger than its competing plans. Using Eq. (4.8), we obtain

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} 4.0 & -0.6 & 89.1 \\ -0.6 & 3.0 & -9.0 \\ 89.1 & -9.0 & 1991.25 \end{pmatrix},$$

a matrix which is positive semidefinite and singular; in particular, $\sigma_{1,2} = -0.6$. It is also noticeable that $\sigma_{3,3} = 1991.25$, which is substantially larger than $\sigma_{1,1}$ and $\sigma_{2,2}$.

Next, we calculate the inequalities (4.2) and (4.3), finding that $\sigma_{1,2} \geq -30.8$ and $\sigma_{1,2} \geq -22.6$, respectively. Since $\sigma_{1,2} = -0.6$ then both inequalities (4.2) and (4.3) are satisfied; thus, for the above covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$, the variance of the risk-transfer amounts for the third plan will increase as its market share decreases.

For $N = 4$, we provide similar calculations. By Eqs. (3.3) or (4.8), we have

$$\sigma_{4,4} = \frac{s_1^2\sigma_{1,1} + s_2^2\sigma_{2,2} + s_3^2\sigma_{3,3} + 2s_1s_2\sigma_{1,2} + 2s_1s_3\sigma_{1,3} + 2s_2s_3\sigma_{2,3}}{(1 - s_1 - s_2 - s_3)^2}.$$

After simplifications, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}(1-s_1 - s_2 - s_3)^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial s_1}\sigma_{4,4} \\ &\quad = s_1\sigma_{1,1} + s_2\sigma_{1,2} + s_3\sigma_{1,3} + s_1s_2\sigma_{1,2} + s_1s_3\sigma_{1,3} - s_1s_2\sigma_{1,1} - s_2s_3\sigma_{1,3} \\ &\qquad - s_2^2\sigma_{1,2} - s_1s_3\sigma_{1,1} - s_2s_3\sigma_{1,2} - s_3^2\sigma_{1,3} + s_2^2\sigma_{2,2} + s_3^2\sigma_{3,3} + 2s_2s_3\sigma_{2,3}. \end{aligned}$$

By differentiation, we find that $\partial\sigma_{4,4}/\partial s_1 \geq 0$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq\ & s_1\sigma_{1,1} + s_2\sigma_{1,2} + s_3\sigma_{1,3} + s_1s_2\sigma_{1,2} + s_1s_3\sigma_{1,3} - s_1s_2\sigma_{1,1} - s_2^2\sigma_{1,2} - s_2s_3\sigma_{1,3} \\ & - s_1s_3\sigma_{1,1} - s_2s_3\sigma_{1,2} - s_3^2\sigma_{1,3} + s_2^2\sigma_{2,2} + s_3^2\sigma_{3,3} + 2s_2s_3\sigma_{2,3}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Similarly, by differentiating with respect to $s_2$ we find that $\partial\sigma_{4,4}/\partial s_2 \geq 0$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq\ & s_2\sigma_{2,2} + s_1\sigma_{1,2} + s_3\sigma_{2,3} - s_1s_2\sigma_{2,2} - s_1s_3\sigma_{1,2} - s_1^2\sigma_{1,2} - s_2s_3\sigma_{2,2} - s_1s_3\sigma_{2,3} \\ & + s_1s_2\sigma_{1,2} - s_3^2\sigma_{2,3} + s_1^2\sigma_{1,1} + s_3^2\sigma_{3,3} + 2s_1s_3\sigma_{1,3}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

and by differentiating with respect to $s_3$ we see that $\partial\sigma_{4,4}/\partial s_3 \geq 0$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq\ & s_3\sigma_{3,3} + s_1\sigma_{1,3} + s_2\sigma_{2,3} - s_1s_3\sigma_{3,3} - s_1s_2\sigma_{2,3} - s_2s_3\sigma_{3,3} - s_1s_2\sigma_{1,3} - s_1^2\sigma_{1,3} \\ & + s_1s_3\sigma_{1,3} + s_2s_3\sigma_{2,3} - s_2^2\sigma_{2,3} + s_1^2\sigma_{1,1} + s_2^2\sigma_{2,2} + 2s_1s_2\sigma_{1,2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Again using the statistical package $R$, or proceeding manually, we generate examples for which these inequalities hold. One such example arises from the covariance matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} 5.0 & -1.0 & 0.8 & 98.7 \\ -1.0 & 4.0 & -0.6 & -10.9 \\ 0.8 & -0.6 & 3.0 & 19.0 \\ 98.7 & -10.9 & 19.0 & 1975.25 \end{pmatrix}$$

With the market shares $s_1 = 0.8$, $s_2 = 0.1$, $s_3 = 0.06$, and $s_4 = 0.04$, it is simple to verify that the inequalities (4.9)-(4.11) are valid. Consequently, in this example, the variance of the risk-transfer amount for Plan 4 will increase as the market shares for Plans 1, 2, or 3 increase.

These examples for $N = 3$ and $N = 4$ raise the issue of whether the general case can be treated as was done at (4.9)-(4.11). To that end, let $\boldsymbol{e} = (1, \ldots, 1)'$ be the $(N-1)\times 1$ column vector whose components all are equal to 1; then $s_N = 1 - s_1 - \cdots - s_{N-1} = 1 - \boldsymbol{e}'\boldsymbol{s}$. By Eq. (3.3),

$$\sigma_{N,N} = (1 - \boldsymbol{e}'\boldsymbol{s})^{-2} \cdot \boldsymbol{s}'\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{s}.$$

Applying the gradient $\boldsymbol{\nabla} = (\partial/\partial s_1, \ldots, \partial s_n)'$ and simplifying the result, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}(1 - \boldsymbol{e}'\boldsymbol{s})^3 \ \boldsymbol{\nabla}\sigma_{N,N} = (1 - \boldsymbol{e}'\boldsymbol{s})\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{s} + (\boldsymbol{s}'\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{s})\boldsymbol{e}. \tag{4.12}$$

Now suppose that all entries of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ are nonnegative. Then each component of the vector $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{s}$ is nonnegative, hence the same holds for $(1 - \boldsymbol{e}'\boldsymbol{s})\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{s}$. Also, since $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ is positive semidefinite then $\boldsymbol{s}'\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{s} \geq 0$. Therefore, if all entries of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ are nonnegative then it follows from Eq. (4.12) that each component of $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\sigma_{N,N}$ is nonnegative. Hence, $\sigma_{N,N}$ will increase as $s_1, \ldots, s_{N-1}$ increase, equivalently, as $s_N$ decreases.

These results show that, for any $N$, it is straightforward to find many instances in which the variance of the risk-transfer amount for a given health-insurance plan will increase as its market share decreases.

# 5 Conclusions

This paper addresses two aspects of the risk-transfer formula in the Affordable Care Act (ACA). The first observation is that for insurance marketplace plans with smaller market shares, the magnitude of their risk-transfer amounts typically are greater than for plans with larger market shares.

Second, we find conditions under which the variance of risk-transfer payments by a plan is a decreasing function of the plan's market share. In such cases, plans with smaller market shares are more likely than larger plans to experience higher volatility.

Given that smaller insurance plans often have lesser capital and that there is no lower bound on the magnitude of risk-transfer amounts, it follows that the generally

higher variability of risk-transfer amounts for smaller insurance plans will place them at increased risk of insolvency.

In any revision of the ACA, these properties of the risk-transfer formula need to be addressed. Although we do not offer here any suggestions on revisions of the risk-transfer formula, it is crucial to note that our results arise purely as a consequence of the mathematical nature of that formula. Therefore, our results are germane to any health-insurance system in which risk-equalization is sought by means of zero-sum transfer payment procedures.

## Acknowledgments

We are grateful to John Fricks and Murali Haran for their support during the time that this research was conducted.

## Disclaimer

The authors wish to report that there are no funding sources or other affiliations that may represent a conflict of interest in the results presented in this paper. The views expressed here are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of their employers.

## Correspondence

Donald Richards, Department of Statistics, 326 Thomas Building, Penn State University, University Park, PA 16802; richards@stat.psu.edu, Tel. (814) 865-3993, Fax. (814) 863-7114.

## References

American Academy of Actuaries (2016). *Insight on the ACA Risk Adjustment Program*. Washington, DC.

Anderson, T. W. (2003). *An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis*, third edition. Wiley, Hoboken, NJ.

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (2016). *HHS-Operated Risk Adjustment Methodology Meeting, Discussion Paper*. Baltimore, MD.

Kautter, J., Pope, G. C., and Keenan, P. (2014). Affordable Care Act risk adjustment: *Overview, context, and challenges. Medicare & Medicaid Research Review*, Volume 4, Number 3, 11 pages.

Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Department of Health and Human Service, Notice of Benefit and Payment Parameters for 2014. *Federal Register*, Volume 78,

Number 47, 15410 (March 11, 2013) (45 CFR Parts 153, 155, 156, et al.).

Pope, G. C., Bachofer, H., Pearlman, A., Kautter, J., Hunter, E., Miller, D., and Keenan, P. (2014). Risk transfer formula for individual and small group markets *under the Affordable Care Act.* *Medicare & Medicaid Research Review*, Volume 4, Number 3, 23 pages.

R Core Team (2013). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL: http://www.R-project.org/.

Ross, S. (2006). *A First Course in Probability*, seventh edition. Prentice-Hall, NJ.